

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

26 April 2001

SUBJECT: 12 April 2001 meeting of the Umbrella Coordination Team (UCT)

NOTICE: The 9 May UCT meeting will be postponed till late May; email notice will be sent when an alternate date is selected. Reason: The Corps' planning consultant will be given primary responsibility for development of the basinwide/main stem portion of the Red River Reconnaissance Report (RRRR). Therefore, we want the consultant (1) to provide a half-day seminar on the Corps' project evaluation process, (2) to gather and review available basinwide/main stem information, and (3) to develop a strategy for this 905(b) analysis [see paragraphs 4-5].

GENERAL

1. Subject meeting was held at the Ramada, Grand Forks, ND, from 1300 – 1600. Members in attendance are indicated by Y in the list below. This list includes four changes to the tentative UCT list in paragraph 13 of my MFR on the 22 March MOST meeting: (a) Mike Sauer will be the sole ND DH representative because Jim Collins, Jr., indicated he is not available, (b) Doug VanDaalen has been designated as NRCS (ND) representative in lieu of Keith Weston, (c) Don Ogaard asked that Dick Nelson be his alternate for the RRWMB spot, and (d), a 19 April, post-meeting email from Doug McNeil indicated that the City of Winnipeg elects to not have an active UCT role, but wishes to be kept apprised on RRRS developments.
2. Understandably, this spring's floodfight caused a number of representatives to miss the 12 April meeting ... conflicts with other commitments and budget problems were other problems. Seven of fifteen unable to attend did not give prior notice by email, phone, or in person. In the future, please let me know ahead of time if you'll be unable to attend.

UMBRELLA COORDINATION TEAM (UCT)				
	ORGANIZATION	REPRESENTATIVE	PHONE	EMAIL
U.S. / Canada Federal				
Y	COE	Tom Raster	651-290-5238	thomas.e.raster@usace.army.mil
Y	USFWS	Terry Ellsworth	701-250-4492	terry_ellsworth@fws.gov
N	NRCS	Doug VanDaalen	701-530-2094	doug.vandaalen@nd.usda.gov
Y		Glen Kajewski	218-681-6600	glen.kajewski@mn.usda.gov
N	Canada PFRA	Alain Vermette	204-984-3694	vermettea@em.agr.ca
Tribal				
N	Red Lake Band	Chuck Meyer	218-679-3959	cmeyer@paulbunyan.net
N	White Earth Band	Monica Hedstrom	218-573-3007	jannette@tvutel.com
State / Province				
Y	MB Conservation – Water	John Towle	204-945-6152	jtowle@gov.mb.ca
N		Steve Topping	204-945-7488	stopping@nr.gov.mb.ca
Y	MB Conservation – Fisheries	Joe O'Connor	204-945-7814	jo'connor@nr.gov.mb.ca
N	MN DNR	Larry Kramka	218-755-3973	larry.kramka@dnr.state.mn.us
N		Gale Mayer	218-755-4482	gale.mayer@dnr.state.mn.us
N	MN PCA	Jeff Lewis	218-846-0730	jeff.lewis@pca.state.mn.us
Y	MN BWSR	Brian Dwight	218-755-3963	brian.dwight@bwsr.state.mn.us
N	ND SWC	Randy Gjestvang	701-282-2318	rgjest@water.swc.state.nd.us
Y		Lee Klapprodt	701-328-4970	lklap@swc.state.nd.us
Y	ND GF	Lynn Schlueter	701-662-3617	lschluet@state.nd.us
Y	ND DH	Mike Sauer	701-328-5237	msauer@state.nd.us
Regional				
Y	RRBB	Chuck Fritz	218-291-0422	chuckr2b2@corpcomm.net
Y	RRWMB	Don Ogaard	218-784-4156	dogaard@means.net
Y		Dick Nelson	218-289-4437	rpn@means.net
Y	RRJWRB	Gary Thompson	701-436-5812	tully@polarcomm.com
Y	Pembina Valley Water Coop	Sam Schellenberg	204-324-1931	pvdcorp@mts.net

Local				
N	Fargo	Mark Bittner	701-241-1572	mhbittner@ci.fargo.nd.us
N	Wahpeton	Jim Azure	701-642-6565	jima@wahpeton.com
Y	GF -EGF	Dean Wieland	701-746-7459	dwieland@prodigy.net
Non-Governmental Organizations				
N	Audubon Society (ND)	Genevieve Thompson	701-298-3373	gthompson@audubon.org
N	MCEA	Mark Ten Eyck	651-223-5969	mtenevck@mncenter.org
N	River Keepers	Bob Backman	701-235-2895	rkeepers@i29.net

3. The group agreed to use these MFRs as “minutes.” If someone wants to add, delete, revise, clarify, or elaborate on a point in an MFR, they may email their contribution to everybody on the UCT ... or just to me, and I’ll forward it to the rest of the UCT.

RECON REPORT REQUIREMENTS

4. According to Corps’ guidance (ER 1105-2-100, paragraph G-7), the reconnaissance phase should accomplish the following:

TASK	COMMENT
Determine if there’s at least one water resource problem that warrants Federal participation in the feasibility phase; defer comprehensive review of other problems/opportunities till the feasibility phase	Federal = Corps of Engineers in this context.
Conduct preliminary appraisal consistent with policy, costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of potential alternatives	Paragraph G-7.c.(4) and (5) talk about using “existing, readily available data” and ‘professional and technical judgment,’ not the detailed economic and environmental analyses in the <i>Principles and Guidelines</i> and related Corps’ regulations.
Complete 905(b) analysis	See below for more detail.
Prepare Project Management Plan (PMP)	PMP = plan-of-study (POS) for feasibility phase.
Identify non-Federal sponsor for cost-shared feasibility and implementation phases; include letter of intent from the non-Federal sponsor	This letter acknowledges sponsor willingness to participate, but is nonbinding.
Negotiate and execute Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA)	This ‘contract’ between the Corps and non-Federal sponsor is a post-RRRR action.

5. The 905(b) analysis (ER 1105-2-100, Exhibit G-2) defines the basic recon report outline:

ITEM	COMMENT
Study authority	
Study purpose	
Location of project/Congressional District	
Discussion of prior studies, reports, and existing water projects	
Plan formulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified problems Alternative plans Preliminary evaluation of alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide existing conditions; ‘without-project’ expected future conditions; problems and opportunities ... with emphasis on those that warrant Corps participation in the feasibility study Description and discussion of likely alternatives. Description and discussion of likely benefits, costs, and environmental impacts.

Federal interest	Conclusion about Corps' role based on preliminary appraisal of benefits, costs, and environmental impacts of alternatives.
Preliminary financial analysis	Include letter of intent from potential non-Federal sponsor stating willingness to participate in cost-shared feasibility study and construction.
Summary of feasibility study assumptions	Describe normal assumptions used for formulation, evaluation, coordination, and reporting ... and anticipated deviations from normal requirements.
Feasibility phase milestones	Taken from POS.
Feasibility phase cost estimate	Taken from POS.
Recommendations	Whether or not to proceed with feasibility study based on likelihood of Federal [Corps] participation in project implementation.
Potential issues affecting initiation of feasibility phase or project implementation	
Views of other resource agencies	
Project area map	

BASINWIDE / MAIN STEM PLAN-OF-STUDY

6. I commented that Chuck Spitzack (Chief of the St. Paul District's Project Management Development Branch) and I discussed how to factor non-subbasin-specific and main stem problems/needs/opportunities into the RRRS. Potential topics include the main stem greenway, main stem ag levees, basinwide DEM, and other topics that don't fit into the expected scope of a tributary subbasin POS (see paragraphs 31-32). The answer is to have a separate 'basinwide/main stem' feasibility study ... which means a separate POS ... which falls into the lap of the UCT.

UCT AND SST EFFORTS

7. Looking at the above recon phase and 905(b) requirements: The areas where the SSTs and UCT (in its role of helping develop the basinwide/main stem POS) are expected to contribute most are (a) problem identification, (b) alternative identification, and (c) preliminary alternative assessments (probably more qualitative than quantitative assessments, although SST and UCT members might have access to hard numbers/information/data that might plug into an assessment).

8. The SSTs and UCT will also be helpful in identifying potential non-Federal sponsors willing to provide the required letters of intent for follow-up feasibility studies. I pointed out that the non-Federal 50% could be any mix of cash or in-kind services. Ogaard noted that the only viable sponsors for a basinwide/main stem feasibility study would be the RRWMB and RRJWRB ... counties and individual communities are unlikely/unable/unwilling to cost share.

9. For a MN subbasin, the obvious non-Federal sponsor is the watershed district, which in turn might partner with the State, FDRWG, RRWMB, etc. to cover its 50% cost share. (Ogaard commented, however, that the Wild Rice (MN) follow-up feasibility study would not be financially supported by the RRWMB.) As a rule, the non-Federal cost share must actually be non-Federal; for example, Nelson advised the group that EPA 319 program funds (administered by the PCA in MN) cannot contribute toward the non-Federal share, even for in-kind services. However, there are exceptions where an agency's regulations allow, e.g., HUD CDBG funds.

10. In ND, potential non-Federal sponsors will be more difficult to define because the county WRB structure doesn't follow watershed boundaries; the UCT didn't have a clear-cut solution to this issue.

EFFORTS TO FORM SSTs

11. I reminded the group about the tight timeline: We need the POS/905(b) write-ups by the end-of-June or the 1st-week-of-July in order to roll them up into the overall RRRR by the end of July, which means that we need to form SSTs ASAP. Efforts to plant ‘SST seeds’:

- I will attend a 17 April meeting in Fairmount, ND, on the proposed “State-Line Dam” ... a 2½- to 3-mile-long E-W embankment across the Bois de Sioux River in the vicinity of White Rock, SD, about 4 miles north of the White Rock Dam which impounds Mud Lake. (There is an alternative alignment 1 mile farther north, along the ND-SD state line.) Jim Azure told me that a Moore Engineering study of this dam showed a potential 70,000 ac-ft of storage. I will be accompanied by Craig Evans, the designated Corps’ Project Manager for the FM-and-upstream SST. I want to use this meeting to promote the RRRS and its follow-up feasibility study for that subbasin as the vehicle for evaluating the State-Line Dam and other proposals ... and encourage stakeholders to help form this subbasin’s SST.
- I will make a RRRS presentation at the 18 April meeting of the WRWD Project Team/Technical Advisory Committee (PT/TAC). [The Pembina River was another candidate for an early-start SST, but I have not yet contacted the Pembina River Basin Advisory Board (PRBAB). Towle says that he is the POC for the PRBAB.] We’ve hypothesized using the WRWD PT/TAC and PRBAB as pseudo-SSTs because we want to piggyback RRRS efforts onto the basin’s existing organizational structures as much as possible, rather than add additional teams/groups/committees. Question: What if the UCT or Corps feels that an existing organizational structure doesn’t have all the right stakeholders for an SST, e.g., what if tribal representation is lacking? The group felt that efforts to get representation should be documented in case an invited stakeholder elects not to participate. The group discussed the ‘you snooze-you lose’ approach that might work with most stakeholders, but does not supersede the relationship between the Federal Government and tribes.

12. Spitzack wants the RRRR to include 905(b) analyses for the basinwide/main stem feasibility study and every subbasin (singly or in combination). But because of the RRRS’s time constraints, these 905(b) analyses and POSs will have differing levels of detail. Some will have a greater level of detail (e.g., FM-and-upstream, Wild Rice, and basinwide/main stem) because of the availability of information, critical need for an early-start feasibility study, etc. Other subbasins will not have the same level of detail in their 905(b) analyses despite the merit of their problems, existing organization, or available information simply because there isn’t sufficient time. In the latter cases, the Corps or its planning consultant will develop an abbreviated 905(b) write-up using professional and technical judgment. Some subbasins, e.g., the Pembina, Roseau, Middle-Snake, etc. have an existing organizational structure that may be able to help the Corps or planning consultant with information for a 905(b) write-up. In subbasins lacking an existing organizational structure (perhaps the Tamarac, Goose, Elm, or combinations like Goose-Elm-Turtle-Forest-Park), the UCT may be able to help the Corps identify an ‘ad hoc SST,’ i.e., key stakeholders to help identify problems/needs/opportunities, alternative solutions, and potential non-Federal sponsors for an abbreviated 905(b) write-up. If Corps’ Higher Authority reviewers feel that the resulting level of detail isn’t adequate, the St. Paul District will ask for supplemental funds and time to beef it up.

PLANNING CONSULTANT

13. I noted that the Corps was in the process of contracting with a planning consultant with experience in preparing basin-type recon reports. Hopefully, the consultant will be on board the 1st week of May. But the Corps hasn’t decided what to have the consultant handle – the basinwide/main stem, one or two subbasins, or pulling the whole shebang together into a cohesive RRRR. A critical factor will be how much money can be sequestered from the \$200,000 appropriated for the RRRS, which also has to cover efforts from St. Paul District project management, engineers, estimators, economists, real estate, and other St. Paul District technical staff asked to contribute to the RRRR.

SST MEETINGS

14. The group discussed different SST meeting scenarios in light of the limited timeline. Probably the best scenario would be to have SSTs formed and meeting in May, which likely limits them to two meetings –

May and June. Spitzack envisioned that, in meeting #1, the Corps' PM or planning consultant would pump the SST (or ad hoc SST) for information on problems/needs/opportunities, alternative solutions, and potential non-Federal sponsors ... and, by meeting #2, would pull together a preliminary draft POS/905(b) write-up for SST review and comment. Then, the Corps or planning consultant would polish the write-up for the RRRR.

15. Several UCT members (Klapprodt, Ogaard, etc.) felt that, instead, the Corps or planning consultant should use existing reports (e.g., the Gulf South report prepared in the early 1980s, RRBB inventory reports, RRBB face-to-face meetings, IFMI public meetings, IJC's *The Next Flood: Getting Prepared and Living with the Red*, FDR WG PT findings, Wild Rice SAPP results to date, PRBAB report, McKombs-Knutson timing study, etc.) to put together 'strawman' 905(b) write-ups to present to the SSTs at the first meeting. Reasons: (a) We shouldn't waste one of just two meetings on 'problem identification' when (b) a wealth of such information has already collected in the basin; in fact, (c) stakeholders have been exposed to 'problem identification' sessions ad nauseam and won't be receptive to more of the same ... they'll want to see that things have progressed beyond that point. Therefore, at meeting #1, the Corps or planning consultant could/should present a preliminary strawman for the SST to react to.

16. Related to the above partial list of data sources, several UCT members expressed frustration with Corps' data archiving and retrieval ... noting many instances where Corps staff asked non-Corps people for copies of reports or information that the Corps itself had developed. Alternatively, when non-Corps folks need Corps' data, they sometimes have to contact retired Corps' staffers because the current personnel doesn't know about old Corps' efforts. Is there a solution to the turnover of personnel and apparent lack of documentation on report/data content and location? Has the practice of microficheing reports and information reduced accessibility?

17. UCT members were negative about the idea of presenting a preliminary draft 905(b) write-up and expecting SST review comments at the same meeting. And UCT members also felt that lots of key stakeholders (watershed district board members, landowner representatives, rural community officials, etc.) are farmers that cannot get away for meetings #1 and #2, which coincide with the height of the farm season. Nor can we expect them to read a document sent to them (say) a week before a meeting. The basic problem is that the timeline is too tight for a reasonable degree of stakeholder involvement and input. What is the consequence of extending the deadline to do a better job? Would a minimum of three meetings (including 1 month between them for review) be better? I noted that our goal is to move the process into the feasibility phase because we don't have sufficient funds in the recon phase to accomplish more even if we had more time.

18. The UCT discussed whether 905(b) write-ups for "the other subbasins" might be extrapolated from the FM-and-upstream and Wild Rice (MN) cases. However, the group felt that subbasin differences in problems and solutions make that approach risky. For example, in some subbasins the solution (and philosophy) will be to clean drains and get the water out quicker; whereas the proper solution in other subbasins will storage to delay runoff.

19. The group debated how to conduct the UCT's SST oversight role to ensure that there are no redundant efforts, that things don't fall through the cracks, that SSTs give proper consideration to potential main stem benefits and adverse impacts, and that SSTs are aware of basinwide consistency criteria (e.g., H&H models, DEM criteria, etc.).

- Spitzack doesn't see having UCT members attend SST meetings. However, I proposed that, because SSTs (or ad hoc SSTs) will meet just in May and June, I (and perhaps some other UCT member) could tough it out and attend each such meeting for the sake of doing the job right.
- Frequently, a UCT member will also be an SST member ... for example, Dwight is on the Wild Rice PT/TAC (which we see serving as SST). In such a case, that UCT member can wear two hats at the SST and UCT meetings: At the SST meeting, he/she should raise SST's awareness to basinwide/main stem issues. At the next UCT meeting, he/she should report on that SST's POS scope.
- What if we can't get an UCT member to all the SST meetings? How can we get messages back-and-forth? With only two SST meetings, email coordination after each SST meeting would be too late and

too infrequent. Could SSTs send someone to report at the next UCT meeting? The Corps' planning consultant could report at UCT meetings; but they come from out-of-state and, therefore, the budget might not be able to afford multiple trips or a long-term stay in the basin.

ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION PROCESS

20. Nelson, Collins, and others criticized the Corps' policy of incremental justification: If there is a proposal for a basinwide FDR system consisting of several component projects, the Corps wants to evaluate the economic feasibility of individual projects (via the benefit/cost ratio), not the overall system. Instead, Nelson et al want the system to be evaluated as a whole ... to develop an overall BCR ... to allow BCR-rich projects to support BCR-poor projects. They argue that a basinwide system does not represent several totally independent projects; it constitutes an integrated system, with each project sized and operated to optimize overall system performance. Therefore, it should be evaluated as a whole.

21. Example: If a watershed has ten candidate projects, the Corps might find economic feasibility for only one project (say an urban levee). Should the Corps evaluate that levee in the context of a standalone project sized as if the other nine component projects will not be built ... or as part of a ten-project integrated system? Nelson et al contend that, when the Corps 'cherry-picks' the crème-de-la-crème (e.g., this levee example), it in effect 'consumes/uses up/steals' the benefits of a more comprehensive plan that might include (say) upstream storage project that could also protect rural/ag areas. Furthermore, when the Corps declares that a project 'lacks feasibility,' that project is stigmatized should non-Federal interests approach the State Legislature for support ... and yet the Corps only looks at NED benefits, whereas a project might make good sense from a regional sense when other benefits are accounted for.

22. Continuing with paragraph 21's example of ten candidate component projects: One of the steps in the Corps' evaluation process is to develop a hypothetical without-project future. If the Corps evaluates each component project individually, does the without-project future envision that individual component as the only project in the basin ... as an add-on to [or maybe first or second or nth step in] a multiple-project, integrated system (which might allow this component to be downsized)? And, if a component is envisioned as part of an integrated system, would the without-project future include only those components that the Corps considers economically feasible ... or include components that non-Federal interests might implement without Federal participation?

23. Continuing with paragraph 21's example of ten candidate component projects: Which of the following evaluation option must the Corps use? Option 1: Does the Corps evaluate the economic feasibility of overall, integrated, basinwide FDR systems consisting of one to ten component projects in all possible combinations, until it finds the combination that maximizes the benefits and still yields an overall BCR ≥ 1 ... which would mean that some benefit-deficient projects are being 'carried' by other, benefit-rich projects? Option 2: Does the Corps evaluate the economic feasibility of each individual component project in the various integrated combinations ... which would mean that the recommended integrated system consists of (say) four projects, each of which has a BCR ≥ 1 ... which means that the other six components are dropped from the recommended project (at least in the eyes of the Corps) ... and the remaining four components are resized to provide an integrated system.

24. Klapprodt and Collins characterized the RRRS's approach [of breaking the Red River basin into subbasins] as a bigger case / same issue. Collins felt that the Corps' incremental justification methodology tends to treat symptoms (e.g., urban flooding) rather than tackling causes (e.g., by providing upper basin storage) that then might yield basinwide benefits.

25. Nelson cited meeting with officials at Corps' Headquarters (Jim Johnson, Joe Rees, etc.) in which he felt that an understanding about the watershed approach was reached.

26. After the meeting, I checked out the Challenge 21 authority (Section 212 of the WRDA of 1999, Public Law 106-53) to see if it suggested a move toward a watershed evaluation approach, but found no such language. And Spitzack and I looked for but couldn't find any new regulations regarding basinwide evaluation.

27. Appendix E (Civil Works Missions and Evaluation Procedures) and Appendix G (Planning Reports and Programs) of ER 1105-2-100 (*Planning Guidance Notebook*, dated 22 April 2000) provide guidance that covers this basic situation: Ordinarily, the Corps recommends the National Economic Development (NED) plan, which maximizes net benefits, i.e., benefits less costs. [Of course, the BCR \geq 1.] Likewise, the National Ecosystem Restoration (NER) plan maximizes ecosystem restoration benefits (but in terms of Habitat Units, rather than dollars). For projects that produce both NED and NER benefits, the Corps looks for the plan that provides the greatest net combination of NED and NER benefits.

28. The Corps can also identify a “locally-preferred plan” (LPP) that might be smaller or larger in scope and cost than the NED, NER, or combined NED/NER plan. [For purposes of simplification, the following discussion is limited to an FDR project and its NED plan and NED benefits.] In the Nelson et al scenario, the LPP would be larger and more costly than the NED plan, in which case paragraph E-3.b.(4) says that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works [ASA(CW)] “may grant an exception as long as the sponsor pays the difference in cost between those plans and the locally preferred plan. The LPP ... must have outputs similar in-kind, and equal to or greater than the outputs of the Federal plan.” This guidance is reiterated in paragraph E-3.c.(5), which states: “The incremental cost between the Federally supportable plan (NED), and a larger locally preferred plan, is entirely a non-Federal responsibility.”

29. I imagine that this guidance envisions an urban levee with the NED plan protecting against (say) a 100-year flood ... but the non-Federal sponsor wants to be protected against a 250-year event ... in which case, the sponsor would be asked to cover the cost for the added degree of protection. Extrapolating this guidance to our example: The 10-component LPP should produce more gross benefits than the NED plan (say a four-component integrated plan) ... but it would produce less net benefits because we’d be adding components that are not incrementally economically justifiable ... and the non-Federal sponsor would have to cover 35% of the NED plan’s cost plus 100% of the cost difference between the LPP and NED plans.

30. Bottom line: The end-result should be beneficial to non-Federal interests even if the Corps’ evaluation methodology requires an incremental, project-by-project approach that limits Corps’ partnership in a multi-project basinwide plan to just a few components. For example, 65% Federal cost sharing in Project A frees non-Federal resources for investment in non-Federal Projects B and C ... and Corps’ partnership in Project A becomes a magnet for State (and other non-Federal) funds that otherwise might not be adequate to implement that particular project.

31. The St. Paul District will invite several non-Federal representatives from the Red River basin to attend a 2-day seminar on the Corps’ project evaluation process which will be put on in the St. Paul District office by the Corps’ planning consultant in late June. In addition, the planning consultant will hold an abbreviated half-day session in conjunction with the May UCT meeting, which will be rescheduled from its original 9 May date.

FUNDING OUTLOOK

32. I showed the group the President’s budget that was released 9 April, which earmarks \$500,000 for follow-up feasibility studies (see table below). With 50/50 cost sharing, this is equivalent to \$1,000,000 in funding and/or in-kind effort ... which is good, but will require scaling down, prioritizing, and stretching the timeline for Red River basin feasibility studies. I showed the following hypothetical breakdown between the FM-and-upstream, Wild Rice (MN), and other follow-up feasibility studies with \$500,000 (= \$1,000,000) AND a theoretical \$1,000,000 (= \$2,000,000) should the House and Senate versions of the budget be beefed-up and prevail.

33. With the \$500,000 allowance, only the FM-and-upstream, Wild Rice (MN), and basinwide/main stem feasibility studies would be started ... and their efforts would be constrained. For example, the Wild Rice would take 2 years instead of the 1 year that I had suggested previously under a funding-unconstrained scenario, which means a 1-year delay in moving to the implementation phase. The FM-and-upstream feasibility study would also be a 2-year effort. But the basinwide/main stem feasibility study would barely get started ... and other efforts, such as Pembina, would have to be postponed. This scenario is shown in

the schedule below, which also presumes that the basinwide/main stem feasibility would be a 2-year effort (which is unlikely unless its funding was beefed-up, too).

FEASIBILITY STUDY	FY 02 RED RIVER FEASIBILITY STUDY FUNDING LEVEL	
	\$500,000 → \$1,000,000	\$1,000,000 → \$2,000,000
F-M and upstream	\$700,000	\$1,000,000
Wild Rice (MN)	\$200,000	\$ 400,000
Pembina	\$ 0	\$ 300,000
Main stem	\$100,000	\$ 150,000
MN watershed mgt plan updates:		
Joe / Two	\$ 0	\$ 50,000
Roseau	\$ 0	\$ 50,000
??	\$ 0	\$ 50,000

	2001												2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D						
IO meeting																		
MOST																		
UCT																		
Wild Rice (MN)																		
Pembina																		
FM & upstream																		
Main stem / basinwide																		
Draft Recon Report																		
Final Recon Report																		
Subbasin X																		
Subbasin Y																		

34. The table shows that, with a \$1,000,000 allowance, the FM-and-upstream and Wild Rice feasibility studies are given a boost in year 1 effort, but not enough to keep the Wild Rice from being a 2-year effort. [Note: Some UCT members opined that the WRWD and its potential cost sharing partners would be in no mood to spend several hundred thousand dollars to upgrade its SAPP-derived watershed management plan update into a Corps' feasibility study. Others felt that the WRWD had plenty of funds to support such an effort.] The extra \$500,000 (= \$1,000,000) would allow the Pembina feasibility study to start and allow other MN watershed management plan updates (Joe/Two Rivers, Roseau, etc.) to marry with Corps' feasibility studies so that those efforts could take advantage of 50/50 cost-sharing support. Those effects are shown in the schedule below.

	2001												2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D						
IO meeting																		
MOST																		
UCT																		
Wild Rice (MN)																		
Pembina																		
FM & upstream																		
Main stem / basinwide																		
Draft Recon Report																		
Final Recon Report																		
Subbasin X																		
Subbasin Y																		

SUBBASIN-NON-SPECIFIC AND MAIN STEM PROBLEMS/NEEDS/OPPORTUNITIES

35. The group identified subjects that are unlikely to fall within the scope of a subbasin POS:

- Greenway-on-the-Red – Contact Genevieve Thompson for more information. Benefits include recreation, NRE (riparian habitat and in-stream WQ), FDR (e.g., retiring flood-prone ag land). Also, contact Dave Rush of the Red River Riparian Group, which covers both main stem and tributaries (bank restoration, ag setbacks, woodlot management, etc.).
- CREP – both MN (via its RIM program) and ND (via some unnamed program).
- Modeling consistency:
 - H&H
 - DEM
 - Mapping – At the last meeting, Mayer talked about LIDAR at \$1000/square mile, with a total exceeding \$30,000,000. Klapprodt and others agreed that we benefit from LIDAR's 1-foot (or whatever) contour accuracy in the ultra-flat lakebed portion of the basin ... but in the beach ridge area and upstream where the terrain is steeper, we don't need 1-foot contours. Klapprodt commented that Corps' hydrologists (Jutila, etc.) would know where high-cost LIDAR was and was not worth it. Schellenberg mentioned that Pembina River basin is partially mapped ... and Klapprodt mentioned that mapping was done in Fargo, Wahpeton, the upper Sheyenne, etc.
- Ag levees

36. There may be other such issues, but the group was pretty well drained by 1600. It seems apparent that it would be helpful to the UCT and any SSTs to have the Corps' planning consultant provide further 905(b) guidance and a draft write-up for the above issues (and any others identified in the interim). I was asked to provide a sample recon report/905(b) write-up ... which the planning consultant may be able to furnish and discuss.

NEWSLETTER

37. There was a feeling that 'word' about the RRRS hasn't gotten around ... that candidates for SSTs are totally unaware of the RRRS. One solution: A "newsletter" ... which I started to draft up a week prior to subject meeting, but hadn't time to complete.

NEXT MEETING

38. The group adopted a schedule of meeting the second Wednesday of each month – 1300-1600 at the Ramada-Grand Forks. However, as per the MFR's opening NOTICE, the 9 May meeting has been postponed.